

I am probably an exception, since I listen to satellite radio at home, not in my car. I subscribe to both XM Radio and Sirius. I like the immediate access to weather that I get from satellite radio. The alternative source for weather for me is not AM or FM radio. The alternative is the Internet. So traditional broadcasters aren't losing a listener in me because of satellite weather. Traditional broadcasters have lost me as a listener because they don't provide the programming that I want to hear. In my case, that's primarily the BBC World Service. Again, I'm sure I'm the exception. But that's what satellite radio can provide: programming of intense interest to audiences that are too small for traditional broadcasters.

Given that I won't be listening to AM or FM radio anyway, why should my choices on satellite radio be limited? In fact, even if the loss of weather were to drive me back to traditional radio, why should the FCC be regulating in such detail what can be broadcast? Does the FCC say that traditional radio is not allowed to broadcast any national or international news, because they are supposed to be a local service? Isn't it just as ridiculous to say satellite radio can't broadcast the weather because satellite radio is supposed to be a national service?

I'm going to Chicago soon. Satellite radio lets me hear about Chicago weather, and not just Washington, D.C. So weather is not entirely of interest only to the local market. That alone ought to be sufficient to show that the FCC has no need to regulate in this area.

Finally, shouldn't competition be encouraged? Let the market decide what programming people are willing to pay for. If satellite radio is better (and that remains to be proven in the marketplace), then let it win its proper place. FM didn't kill AM. TV didn't kill radio. Satellite radio won't kill traditional radio. It may change traditional radio. But that's OK. That's part of change and progress.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.